arXiv:1104.3475v2 [math.MG] 5 Mar 2012

# NEWTONIAN LORENTZ METRIC SPACES

ŞERBAN COSTEA AND MICHELE MIRANDA JR.

Abstract. This paper studies Newtonian Sobolev-Lorentz spaces. We prove that these spaces are Banach. We also study the global $p,q$-capacity and the $p,q$-modulus of families of rectifiable curves. Under some additional assumptions (that is, $X$ carries a doubling measure and a weak Poincaré inequality), we show that when $1 \leq q < p$ the Lipschitz functions are dense in these spaces; moreover, in the same setting we show that the $p,q$-capacity is Choquet provided that $q > 1$. We also provide a counterexample to the density result in the Euclidean setting when $1 < p \leq n$ and $q = \infty$.

## 1. Introduction

In this paper $(X,d)$ is a complete metric space endowed with a nontrivial Borel regular measure $\mu$. We assume that $\mu$ is finite and nonzero on nonempty bounded open sets. In particular, this implies that the measure $\mu$ is $\sigma$-finite. Further restrictions on the space $X$ and on the measure $\mu$ will be imposed later.

The Sobolev-Lorentz relative $p,q$-capacity was studied in the Euclidean setting by Costea [6] and Costea-Maz'ya [8]. The Sobolev $p$-capacity was studied by Maz'ya [24] and Heinonen-Kilpeläinen-Martio [16] in $\mathbf{R}^n$ and by Costea [7] and Kinnunen-Martio [21] and [22] in metric spaces. The relative Sobolev $p$-capacity in metric spaces was introduced by J. Björn in [2] when studying the boundary continuity properties of quasiminimizers.

After recalling the definition of $p,q$-Lorentz spaces in metric spaces, we study some useful property of the $p,q$-modulus of families of curves needed to give the notion of $p,q$-weak upper gradients. Then, following the approach of Shanmugalingam in [27] and [28], we generalize the notion of Newtonian Sobolev spaces to the Lorentz setting. There are several other definitions of Sobolev-type spaces in the metric setting when $p = q$; see Hajłasz [12], Heinonen-Koskela [17], Cheeger [4], and Franchi-Hajłasz-Koskela [11]. It has been shown that under reasonable hypotheses, the majority of these definitions yields the same space; see Franchi-Hajłasz-Koskela [11] and Shanmugalingam [27].

We prove that these spaces are Banach. In order to this, we develop a theory of Sobolev $p,q$-capacity. Some of the ideas used here when proving the properties of the $p,q$-capacity follow Kinnunen-Martio [21] and [22] and Costea [7]. We also use this theory to prove that, in the case $1 \leq q < p$, Lipschitz functions are dense in the Newtonian Sobolev-Lorentz space if the space $X$ carries a doubling measure $\mu$ and a weak $(1, L^{p,q})$-Poincaré inequality. Newtonian Banach-valued Sobolev-Lorentz spaces were studied by Podbrdsky in [26].

We prove that under certain restrictions (when $1 < q \leq p$ and the space $(X,d)$ carries a doubling measure $\mu$ and a certain weak Poincaré inequality) this capacity is a Choquet set function.

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 31C15, 46E35.

*Key words and phrases.* Newtonian spaces, Lorentz spaces, capacity.

We recall the standard notation and definitions to be used throughout this paper. We denote by $B(x,r)=\{y\in X : d(x,y)<r\}$ the open ball with center $x\in X$ and radius $r>0$, while $\overline{B}(x,r)=\{y\in X : d(x,y)\le r\}$ is the closed ball with center $x\in X$ and radius $r>0$. For a positive number $\lambda$, $\lambda B(a,r)=B(a,\lambda r)$ and $\lambda\overline{B}(a,r)=\overline{B}(a,\lambda r)$.

Throughout this paper, $C$ will denote a positive constant whose value is not necessarily the same at each occurrence; it may vary even within a line. $C(a,b,\dots)$ is a constant that depends only on the parameters $a,b,\dots$. For $E\subset X$, the boundary, the closure, and the complement of $E$ with respect to $X$ will be denoted by $\partial E$, $\overline{E}$, and $X\setminus E$, respectively; diam $E$ is the diameter of $E$ with respect to the metric $d$.

## 2. Lorentz spaces

Let $f : X\to[-\infty,\infty]$ be a $\mu$-measurable function. We define $\mu_{[f]}$, the *distribution function* of $f$ as follows (see Bennett-Sharpley [1, Definition II.1.1]):

$$\mu_{[f]}(t)=\mu(\{x\in X : |f(x)|>t\}), \qquad t\ge 0.$$

We define $f^*$, the *nonincreasing rearrangement* of $f$ by

$$f^*(t)=\inf\{v : \mu_{[f]}(v)\le t\}, \quad t\ge 0.$$

(See Bennett-Sharpley [1, Definition II.1.5].) We note that $f$ and $f^*$ have the same distribution function. For every positive $\alpha$ we have

$$(|f|^\alpha)^*=(|f|^*)^\alpha$$

and if $|g|\le|f|$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$, then $g^*\le f^*$. (See [1, Proposition II.1.7].) We also define $f^{**}$, the *maximal function* of $f^*$ by

$$f^{**}(t)=m_{f^*}(t)=\frac{1}{t}\int_0^t f^*(s)ds, \quad t>0.$$

(See [1, Definition II.3.1].)

Throughout the paper, we denote by $p'$ the Hölder conjugate of $p\in[1,\infty]$.

The *Lorentz space* $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$, $1<p<\infty$, $1\le q\le\infty$, is defined as follows:

$$L^{p,q}(X,\mu)=\{f : X\to[-\infty,\infty] : f \text{ is } \mu\text{-measurable}, \ ||f||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}<\infty\},$$

where

$$||f||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}=||f||_{p,q}=\begin{cases}\left(\displaystyle\int_0^\infty (t^{1/p}f^*(t))^q\,\frac{dt}{t}\right)^{1/q}, & 1\le q<\infty,\\[2ex] \displaystyle\sup_{t>0} t\mu_{[f]}(t)^{1/p}=\sup_{s>0} s^{1/p}f^*(s), & q=\infty.\end{cases}$$

(See Bennett-Sharpley [1, Definition IV.4.1] and Stein-Weiss [29, p. 191].)

If $1\le q\le p$, then $||\cdot||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$ represents a norm, but for $p<q\le\infty$ it represents a quasinorm, equivalent to the norm $||\cdot||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)}$, where

$$||f||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)}=||f||_{(p,q)}=\begin{cases}\left(\displaystyle\int_0^\infty (t^{1/p}f^{**}(t))^q\,\frac{dt}{t}\right)^{1/q}, & 1\le q<\infty,\\[2ex] \displaystyle\sup_{t>0} t^{1/p}f^{**}(t), & q=\infty.\end{cases}$$

(See [1, Definition IV.4.4].) Namely, from [1, Lemma IV.4.5] we have that

$$||f||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||f||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \leq p'||f||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$$

for every $q \in [1,\infty]$ and every $\mu$-measurable function $f : X \to [-\infty,\infty]$.

It is known that $(L^{p,q}(X,\mu), ||\cdot||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)})$ is a Banach space for $1 \leq q \leq p$, while $(L^{p,q}(X,\mu), ||\cdot||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)})$ is a Banach space for $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. In addition, if the measure $\mu$ is nonatomic, the aforementioned Banach spaces are reflexive when $1 < q < \infty$. (See Hunt [18, p. 259-262] and Bennett-Sharpley [1, Theorem IV.4.7 and Corollaries I.4.3 and IV.4.8].) (A measure $\mu$ is called *nonatomic* if for every measurable set $A$ of positive measure there exists a measurable set $B \subset A$ such that $0 < \mu(B) < \mu(A)$.)

**Definition 2.1.** (See [1, Definition I.3.1].) Let $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Let $Y = L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. A function $f$ in $Y$ is said to have absolutely continuous norm in $Y$ if and only if $||f\chi_{E_k}||_Y \to 0$ for every sequence $E_k$ of $\mu$-measurable sets satisfying $E_k \to \emptyset$ $\mu$-almost everywhere.

Let $Y_a$ be the subspace of $Y$ consisting of functions of absolutely continuous norm and let $Y_b$ be the closure in $Y$ of the set of simple functions. It is known that $Y_a = Y_b$ whenever $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. (See Bennett-Sharpley [1, Theorem I.3.13].) Moreover, since $(X,\mu)$ is a $\sigma$-finite measure space, we have $Y_b = Y$ whenever $1 \leq q < \infty$. (See Hunt [18, p. 258-259].)

We recall (see Costea [6]) that in the Euclidean setting (that is, when $\mu = m_n$ is the $n$-dimensional Lebesgue measure and $d$ is the Euclidean distance on $\mathbb{R}^n$) we have $Y_a \neq Y$ for $Y = L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)$ whenever $X$ is an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Let $X = B(0,2)\setminus\{0\}$. As in Costea [6] we define $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$,

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}} & \text{if } 0 < |x| < 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 \leq |x| \leq 2. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

It is easy to see that $u \in L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)$ and moreover,

$$||u\chi_{B(0,\alpha)}||_{L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)} = ||u||_{L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)} = m_n(B(0,1))^{1/p}$$

for every $\alpha > 0$. This shows that $u$ does not have absolutely continuous weak $L^p$-norm and therefore $L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)$ does not have absolutely continuous norm.

*Remark* 2.2. It is also known (see [1, Proposition IV.4.2]) that for every $p \in (1,\infty)$ and $1 \leq r < s \leq \infty$ there exists a constant $C(p,r,s)$ such that

$$||f||_{L^{p,s}(X,\mu)} \leq C(p,r,s)||f||_{L^{p,r}(X,\mu)} \tag{2}$$

for all measurable functions $f \in L^{p,r}(X,\mu)$. In particular, the embedding $L^{p,r}(X,\mu) \hookrightarrow L^{p,s}(X,\mu)$ holds.

*Remark* 2.3. Via Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition II.1.7 and Definition IV.4.1] it is easy to see that for every $p \in (1,\infty)$, $q \in [1,\infty]$ and $0 < \alpha \leq \min(p,q)$, we have

$$||f||^{\alpha}_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = ||f^{\alpha}||_{L^{\frac{p}{\alpha},\frac{q}{\alpha}}(X,\mu)}$$

for every nonnegative function $f \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$.

2.1. **The subadditivity and superadditivity of the Lorentz quasinorms.** We recall the known results and present new results concerning the superadditivity and the subadditivity of the Lorentz $p, q$-quasinorm. For the convenience of the reader, we will provide proofs for the new results and for some of the known results.

The superadditivity of the Lorentz $p, q$-norm in the case $1 \leq q \leq p$ was stated in Chung-Hunt-Kurtz [5, Lemma 2.5].

**Proposition 2.4.** *(See* [5, Lemma 2.5]*.) Let $(X, \mu)$ be a measure space. Suppose that $1 \leq q \leq p$. Let $\{E_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a collection of pairwise disjoint $\mu$-measurable subsets of $X$ with $E_0 = \cup_{i \geq 1} E_i$ and let $f \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Then*

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} ||\chi_{E_i} f||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||\chi_{E_0} f||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

A similar result concerning the superadditivity was obtained in Costea-Maz'ya [8, Proposition 2.4] for the case $1 < p < q < \infty$ when $X = \Omega$ was an open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mu$ was an arbitrary measure. That result is valid for a general measure space $(X, \mu)$.

**Proposition 2.5.** *Let $(X, \mu)$ be a measure space. Suppose that $1 < p < q < \infty$. Let $\{E_i\}_{i \geq 1}$ be a collection of pairwise disjoint $\mu$-measurable subsets of $X$ with $E_0 = \cup_{i \geq 1} E_i$ and let $f \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Then*

$$\sum_{i \geq 1} ||\chi_{E_i} f||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||\chi_{E_0} f||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

*Proof.* We mimic the proof of Proposition 2.4 from Costea-Maz'ya [8]. We replace $\Omega$ with $X$. $\square$

We have a similar result for the subadditivity of the Lorentz $p, q$-quasinorm. When $1 < p < q \leq \infty$ we obtain a result that generalizes Theorem 2.5 from Costea [6].

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let $(X, \mu)$ be a measure space. Suppose that $1 < p < q \leq \infty$. Suppose $f_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots$ is a sequence of functions in $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ and let $f_0 = \sup_{i \geq 1} |f_i|$. Then*

$$||f_0||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ||f_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we can assume that all the functions $f_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots$ are nonnegative. We have to consider two cases, depending on whether $p < q < \infty$ or $q = \infty$.

Let $\mu_{[f_i]}$ be the distribution function of $f_i$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. It is easy to see that

$$\mu_{[f_0]}(s) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu_{[f_i]}(s) \text{ for every } s \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Suppose that $p < q < \infty$. We have (see Kauhanen-Koskela-Malý [20, Proposition 2.1])

$$||f_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = \left( p \int_0^{\infty} s^{q-1} \mu_{[f_i]}(s)^{\frac{q}{p}} ds \right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \tag{4}$$

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ . From this and (3) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} ||f_0||^p_{L^{p,q}(\Omega,\mu)} &= \left(p\int_0^\infty s^{q-1}\mu_{[f_0]}(s)^{\frac{q}{p}}ds\right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \le \sum_{i\ge 1}\left(p\int_0^\infty s^{q-1}\mu_{[f_i]}(s)^{\frac{q}{p}}ds\right)^{\frac{p}{q}} \\ &= \sum_{i\ge 1}||f_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(\Omega,\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, suppose that $q = \infty$. From (3) we obtain

$$s^p\,\mu_{[f_0]}(s) \le \sum_{i\ge 1}(s^p\,\mu_{[f_i]}(s)) \text{ for every } s > 0,$$

which implies

$$s^p\,\mu_{[f_0]}(s) \le \sum_{i\ge 1}||f_i||^p_{L^{p,\infty}(X,\mu)} \text{ for every } s > 0. \tag{5}$$

By taking the supremum over all $s > 0$ in (5), we get the desired conclusion. This finishes the proof.

□

We recall a few results concerning Lorentz spaces.

**Theorem 2.7.** *(See* [6, Theorem 2.6]*.) Suppose* $1 < p < q \le \infty$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$*. Let* $f_1, f_2 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$*. We denote* $f_3 = f_1 + f_2$*. Then* $f_3 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ *and*

$$||f_3||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \le (1-\varepsilon)^{-p}||f_1||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + \varepsilon^{-p}||f_2||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 2.6 from Costea [6] carries verbatim. We replace $\Omega$ with $X$.

□

Theorem 2.7 has an useful corollary.

**Corollary 2.8.** *(See* [6, Corollary 2.7]*.) Suppose* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \le q \le \infty$*. Let* $f_k$ *be a sequence of functions in* $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ *converging to* $f$ *with respect to the* $p, q$*-quasinorm and pointwise* $\mu$*-almost everywhere in* $X$*. Then*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}||f_k||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = ||f||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

*Proof.* The proof of Corollary 2.7 from Costea [6] carries verbatim. We replace $\Omega$ with $X$.

□

## 3. P,Q-MODULUS OF THE PATH FAMILY

In this section, we establish some results about $p, q$-modulus of families of curves. Here $(X, d, \mu)$ is a metric measure space. We say that a curve $\gamma$ in $X$ is rectifiable if it has finite length. Whenever $\gamma$ is rectifiable, we use the arc length parametrization $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$, where $\ell(\gamma)$ is the length of the curve $\gamma$.

Let $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ denote the family of all nonconstant rectifiable curves in $X$. It may well be that $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} = \emptyset$, but we will be interested in metric spaces for which $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ is sufficiently large.

**Definition 3.1.** For $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$, let $F(\Gamma)$ be the family of all Borel measurable functions $\rho : X \to [0, \infty]$ such that

$$\int_\gamma \rho \geq 1 \text{ for every } \gamma \in \Gamma.$$

Now for each $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ we define

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = \inf_{\rho \in F(\Gamma)} ||\rho||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

The number $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma)$ is called the *p,q-modulus* of the family $\Gamma$.

### 3.1. Basic properties of the $p,q$-modulus.

Usually, a modulus is a monotone and subadditive set function. The following theorem will show, among other things, that this is true in the case of the $p, q$-modulus.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Suppose* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. *The set function* $\Gamma \to \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma)$, $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$, *enjoys the following properties:*

(i) $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\emptyset) = 0$.

(ii) *If* $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$, *then* $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \leq \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2)$.

(iii) *Suppose* $1 \leq q \leq p$. *Then*

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \Gamma_i)^{q/p} \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i)^{q/p}.$$

(iv) *Suppose* $p < q \leq \infty$. *Then*

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\bigcup_{i=1}^\infty \Gamma_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i).$$

*Proof.* (i) $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\emptyset) = 0$ because $\rho \equiv 0 \in F(\emptyset)$.

(ii) If $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_2$, then $F(\Gamma_2) \subset F(\Gamma_1)$ and hence $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \leq \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2)$.

(iii) Suppose that $1 \leq q \leq p$. The case $p = q$ corresponds to the $p$-modulus and the claim certainly holds in that case. (See for instance Hajłasz [13, Theorem 5.2 (3)].) So we can look at the case $1 \leq q < p$.

We can assume without loss of generality that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i)^{q/p} < \infty.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Take $\rho_i \in F(\Gamma_i)$ such that

$$||\rho_i||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i)^{q/p} + \varepsilon 2^{-i}.$$

Let $\rho := (\sum_{i=1}^\infty \rho_i^q)^{1/q}$. We notice via Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition II.1.7 and Definition IV.4.1] and Remark 2.3 applied with $\alpha = q$ that

$$\rho_i^q \in L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu) \text{ and } ||\rho_i^q||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)} = ||\rho_i||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}. \tag{6}$$

for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots$. By using (6) and Remark 2.3 together with the definition of $\rho$ and the fact that $||\cdot||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)}$ is a norm when $1 \leq q \leq p$, it follows that $\rho \in F(\Gamma)$ and

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i)^{q/p} \leq ||\rho||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty ||\rho_i||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i)^{q/p} + 2\varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we complete the proof when $1 \leq q \leq p$.

(iv) Suppose now that $p < q \leq \infty$. We can assume without loss of generality that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i) < \infty.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. Take $\rho_i \in F(\Gamma_i)$ such that

$$||\rho_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i}.$$

Let $\rho := \sup_{i \geq 1} \rho_i$. Then $\rho \in F(\Gamma)$. Moreover, from Proposition 2.6 it follows that $\rho \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) \leq ||\rho||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} ||\rho_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_i) + 2\varepsilon.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we complete the proof when $p < q \leq \infty$.

□

So we proved that the modulus is a monotone function. Also, the shorter the curves, the larger the modulus. More precisely, we have:

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$. If each curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$ contains a subcurve that belongs to $\Gamma_2$, then $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \leq \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2)$.*

*Proof.* $F(\Gamma_2) \leq F(\Gamma_1)$.

□

The following theorem provides an useful characterization of path families that have $p,q$-modulus zero.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$. Then $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = 0$ if and only if there exists a Borel measurable function $0 \leq \rho \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ such that $\int_\gamma \rho = \infty$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$.*

*Proof.* Sufficiency. We notice that $\rho/n \in F(\Gamma)$ for every $n$ and hence

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} ||\rho/n||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0.$$

Necessity. There exists $\rho_i \in F(\Gamma)$ such that $||\rho_i||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} < 2^{-i}$ and $\int_\gamma \rho_i \geq 1$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Then $\rho := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \rho_i$ has the required properties.

□

**Corollary 3.5.** *Suppose $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ are given. If $0 \leq g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ is Borel measurable, then $\int_\gamma g < \infty$ for p, q-almost every $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$.*

The following theorem is also important.

**Theorem 3.6.** *Let $u_k : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}} = [-\infty, \infty]$ be a sequence of Borel functions which converge to a Borel function $u : X \to \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. Then there is a subsequence $(u_{k_j})_j$ such that*

$$\int_\gamma |u_{k_j} - u| \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty,$$

*for $p,q$-almost every curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$.*

*Proof.* We follow Hajłasz [13]. We take a subsequence $(u_{k_j})_j$ such that

$$||u_{k_j} - u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < 2^{-2j}. \tag{7}$$

Set $g_j = |u_{k_j} - u|$, and let $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of curves such that

$$\limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_\gamma g_j > 0.$$

We want to show that $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = 0$. Denote by $\Gamma_j$ the family of curves in $\Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ for which $\int_\gamma g_j > 2^{-j}$. Then $2^j g_j \in F(\Gamma_j)$ and hence $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_j) < 2^{-pj}$ as a consequence of (7). We notice that

$$\Gamma \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{j=i}^{\infty} \Gamma_j.$$

Thus

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma)^{1/p} \le \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_j)^{1/p} \le \sum_{j=i}^{\infty} 2^{-j} = 2^{1-i}$$

for every integer $i \geq 1$, which implies $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = 0$. □

### 3.2. **Upper gradient.**

**Definition 3.7.** Let $u : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$ be a Borel function. We say that a Borel function $g : X \to [0, \infty]$ is an *upper gradient* of $u$ if for *every* rectifiable curve $\gamma$ parametrized by arc length parametrization we have

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g \tag{8}$$

whenever both $u(\gamma(0))$ and $u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))$ are finite and $\int_\gamma g = \infty$ otherwise. We say that $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u$ if (8) holds on $p, q$-almost every curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$.

The weak upper gradients were introduced in the case $p = q$ by Heinonen-Koskela in [17]. See also Heinonen [15] and Shanmugalingam [27] and [28].

If $g$ is an upper gradient of $u$ and $\widetilde{g} = g$, $\mu$-almost everywhere, is another nonnegative Borel function, then it might happen that $\widetilde{g}$ is not an upper gradient of $u$. However, we have the following result.

**Lemma 3.8.** *If $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u$ and $\widetilde{g}$ is another nonnegative Borel function such that $\widetilde{g} = g$ $\mu$-almost everywhere, then $\widetilde{g}$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u$.*

*Proof.* Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of all nonconstant rectifiable curves $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$ for which $\int_\gamma |g - \widetilde{g}| > 0$. The constant sequence $g_n = |g - \widetilde{g}|$ converges to 0 in $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$, so from Theorem 3.6 it follows that $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$ and $\int_\gamma |g - \widetilde{g}| = 0$ for every nonconstant rectifiable curve $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$ that is not in $\Gamma_1$.

Let $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of all nonconstant rectifiable curves $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$ for which the inequality

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) = 0$. For every $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ not in $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ we have

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g = \int_\gamma \widetilde{g}.$$

This finishes the proof.

□

The next result shows that $p, q$-weak upper gradients can be nicely approximated by upper gradients. The case $p = q$ was proved by Koskela-MacManus [23].

**Lemma 3.9.** *If $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u$ which is finite $\mu$-almost everywhere, then for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an upper gradient $g_\varepsilon$ of $u$ such that*

$$g_\varepsilon \geq g \text{ everywhere on } X \text{ and } ||g_\varepsilon - g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

*Proof.* Let $\Gamma \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of all nonconstant rectifiable curves $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$ for which the inequality

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = 0$ and hence, from Theorem 3.4 it follows that there exists $0 \leq \rho \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ such that $\int_\gamma \rho = \infty$ for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Take $g_\varepsilon = g + \varepsilon\rho/||\rho||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$. Then $g_\varepsilon$ is a nonnegative Borel function and

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g_\varepsilon$$

for *every* curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$. This finishes the proof.

□

If $A$ is a subset of $X$ let $\Gamma_A$ be the family of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ that intersect $A$ and let $\Gamma_A^+$ be the family of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that the Hausdorff one-dimensional measure $\mathcal{H}_1(|\gamma| \cap A)$ is positive. Here and throughout the paper $|\gamma|$ is the image of the curve $\gamma$.

The following lemma will be useful later in this paper.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let $u_i : X \to \mathbb{R}$, $i \geq 1$, be a sequence of Borel functions such that $g \in L^{p,q}(X)$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for every $u_i$, $i \geq 1$. We define $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x)$ and $E = \{x \in X : |u(x)| = \infty\}$. Suppose that $\mu(E) = 0$ and that $u$ is well-defined outside $E$. Then $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$.*

*Proof.* For every $i \geq 1$ we define $\Gamma_{1,i}$ to be the set of all curves $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ for which

$$|u_i(\gamma(0)) - u_i(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{1,i}) = 0$ and hence $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$, where $\Gamma_1 = \cup_{i=1}^\infty \Gamma_{1,i}$.

Let $\Gamma_0$ be the collection of all paths $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that $\int_\gamma g = \infty$. Then we have via Theorem 3.4 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$ since $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$.

Since $\mu(E) = 0$, it follows that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E^+) = 0$. Indeed, $\infty \cdot \chi_E \in F(\Gamma_E^+)$ and $||\infty \cdot \chi_E||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0$. Therefore $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_E^+ \cup \Gamma_1) = 0$.

For any path $\gamma$ in the family $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_E^+ \cup \Gamma_1)$, by the fact that the path is not in $\Gamma_E^+$, there exists a point $y$ in $|\gamma|$ such that $y$ is not in $E$, that is $y \in |\gamma|$ and $|u(y)| < \infty$. For any point $x \in |\gamma|$, we have (since $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_{1,i}$)

$$|u_i(x)| - |u_i(y)| \leq |u_i(x) - u_i(y)| \leq \int_\gamma g < \infty.$$

Therefore

$$|u_i(x)| \leq |u_i(y)| + \int_\gamma g.$$

Taking limits on both sides and using the facts that $|u(y)| < \infty$ and that $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1$, we see that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} |u_i(x)| \leq \lim_{i\to\infty} |u_i(y)| + \int_\gamma g = |u(y)| + \int_\gamma g < \infty$$

and therefore $x$ is not in $E$. Thus $\Gamma_E \subset \Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_E^+ \cup \Gamma_1$ and $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E) = 0$.

Next, let $\gamma$ be a path in $\Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_E^+ \cup \Gamma_1)$. The above argument showed that $|\gamma|$ does not intersect $E$. If we denote by $x$ and $y$ the endpoints of $\gamma$, we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)| = |\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x) - \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(y)| = \lim_{i\to\infty} |u_i(x) - u_i(y)| \le \int_\gamma g.$$

Therefore $g$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $u$ as well.

□

The following proposition shows how the upper gradients behave under a change of variable.

**Proposition 3.11.** *Let $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be $C^1$ and let $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel function. If $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $u$, then $|F'(u)|g$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $F \circ u$.*

*Proof.* Let $\Gamma_0$ to be the set of all curves $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ for which

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$. Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the collection of all curves having a subcurve in $\Gamma_0$. Then $F(\Gamma_0) \subset F(\Gamma_1)$ and hence $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \le \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$.

Let $\Gamma_2$ be the set of curves $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ for which $\int_\gamma g = \infty$. Then we have via Theorem 3.4 that $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$ since $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Thus $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) = 0$.

The claim will follow immediately after we show that

$$|(F \circ u)(\gamma(0)) - (F \circ u)(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)} (|F'(u(\gamma(s)))| + \varepsilon) g(\gamma(s))\, ds. \tag{9}$$

for all curves $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$ and for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

So fix $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose a curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$. Let $\ell = \ell(\gamma)$. We notice immediately that $u \circ \gamma$ is uniformly continuous on $[0, \ell]$ and $F'$ is uniformly continuous on the compact interval $I := (u \circ \gamma)([0, \ell])$. Let $\delta, \delta_1 > 0$ be chosen such that

$$|(F' \circ u \circ \gamma)(t) - (F' \circ u \circ \gamma)(s)| + |(u \circ \gamma)(t) - (u \circ \gamma)(s)| < \delta_1$$

for all $t, s \in [0, \ell]$ with $|t - s| < \delta$ and such that

$$|F'(u) - F'(v)| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } u, v \in I \text{ with } |u - v| < \delta_1.$$

Fix an integer $n > 1/\delta$ and put $\ell_i = (i\ell)/n, i = 0, \dots, n-1$. For every $i = 0, \dots, n-1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(F \circ u \circ \gamma)(\ell_{i+1}) - (F \circ u \circ \gamma)(\ell_i)| &= |F'(t_{i,i+1}))|\, |(u \circ \gamma)(\ell_{i+1}) - (u \circ \gamma)(\ell_i)| \\ &\le |F'(t_{i,i+1}))| \int_{\ell_i}^{\ell_{i+1}} g(\gamma(s))\, ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $t_{i,i+1} \in I_{i,i+1} := (u \circ \gamma)((\ell_i, \ell_{i+1}))$. From the choice of $\delta$ it follows that

$$|(F \circ u \circ \gamma)(\ell_{i+1}) - (F \circ u \circ \gamma)(\ell_i)| \le \int_{\ell_i}^{\ell_{i+1}} (|F'(u(\gamma(s)))| + \varepsilon)\, g(\gamma(s))\, ds,$$

for every $i = 0, \dots, n-1$. If we sum over $i$ we obtain easily (9). This finishes the proof. □

As a direct consequence of Proposition 3.11, we have the following corollaries.

**Corollary 3.12.** *Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ be fixed. Suppose $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded nonnegative Borel function. If $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u$, then $ru^{r-1}g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u^r$.*

*Proof.* Let $M > 0$ be such that $0 \le u(x) < M$ for all $x \in X$. We apply Proposition 3.11 to any $C^1$ function $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $F(t) = t^r, 0 \le t \le M$.

$\square$

**Corollary 3.13.** *Let $r \in (0, 1)$ be fixed. Suppose that $u : X \to \mathbb{R}$ is a nonnegative function that has a $p, q$-weak upper gradient $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Then $r(u + \varepsilon)^{r-1}g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $(u + \varepsilon)^r$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

*Proof.* Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. We apply Proposition 3.11 to any $C^1$ function $F : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $F(t) = t^r, \varepsilon \le t < \infty$.

$\square$

**Corollary 3.14.** *Suppose $1 \le q \le p < \infty$. Let $u_1, u_2$ be two nonnegative bounded real-valued functions defined on $X$. Suppose $g_i \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu), i = 1, 2$ are $p, q$-weak upper gradients for $u_i, i = 1, 2$. Then $L^{p,q}(X, \mu) \ni g := (g_1^q + g_2^q)^{1/q}$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u := (u_1^q + u_2^q)^{1/q}$.*

*Proof.* The claim is obvious when $q = 1$, so we assume without loss of generality that $1 < q \le p$. We prove first that $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Indeed, via Remark 2.3 it is enough to show that $g^q \in L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X, \mu)$. But $g^q = g_1^q + g_2^q$ and $g_i^q \in L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X, \mu)$ since $g_i \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. (See Remark 2.3.) This, the fact that $|| \cdot ||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)}$ is a norm whenever $1 < q \le p$, and another appeal to Remark 2.3 yield $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} ||g||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} &= ||g^q||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)} \le ||g_1^q||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)} + ||g_2^q||_{L^{\frac{p}{q},1}(X,\mu)} \\ &= ||g_1||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g_2||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}. \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, 2$ let $\Gamma_{i,1}$ be the family of nonconstant rectifiable curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ for which

$$|u_i(x) - u_i(x)| \le \int_\gamma g_i$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{i,1}) = 0$ since $g_i$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u_i, i = 1, 2$.

Let $\Gamma_{i,2}$ be the family of nonconstant rectifiable curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ for which $\int_\gamma g_i = \infty$. Then for $i = 1, 2$ we have $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{i,2}) = 0$ via Theorem 3.4 because by hypothesis $g_i \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu), i = 1, 2$. Let $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2} \cup \Gamma_{2,1} \cup \Gamma_{2,2}$. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By applying Corollary 3.12 with $r = q$ to the functions $u_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, we see that $L^{p,q}(X, \mu) \ni q(u_i + \varepsilon)^{q-1}g_i$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $(u_i + \varepsilon)^q$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus via Hölder's inequality it follows that $G_\varepsilon$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $U_\varepsilon$, where

$$G_\varepsilon := q((u_1 + \varepsilon)^q + (u_2 + \varepsilon)^q)^{(q-1)/q}(g_1^q + g_2^q)^{1/q} \text{ and } U_\varepsilon := (u_1 + \varepsilon)^q + (u_2 + \varepsilon)^q.$$

We notice that $G_\varepsilon \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Indeed, $G_\varepsilon = qU_\varepsilon^{(q-1)/q}g$, with $U_\varepsilon$ nonnegative a bounded and $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$, so $G_\varepsilon \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$.

Now we apply Corollary 3.13 with $r = 1/q$, $u = U_\varepsilon$ and $g = G_\varepsilon$ to obtain that $u_\varepsilon := U_\varepsilon^{1/q}$ has $1/qU_\varepsilon^{(1-q)/q}G_\varepsilon = g$ as a $p, q$-weak upper gradient that belongs to $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. In fact, by looking at the proof of Proposition 3.11, we see that

$$|u_\varepsilon(x) - u_\varepsilon(y)| \le \int_\gamma g$$

for every curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ that is not in $\Gamma_0$. Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we obtain the desired conclusion. This finishes the proof of the corollary.

$\square$

**Lemma 3.15.** *If $u_i, i = 1, 2$ are nonnegative real-valued Borel functions in $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ with corresponding $p, q$-weak upper gradients $g_i \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$, then $g := \max(g_1, g_2) \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u := \max(u_1, u_2) \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that $u, g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. For $i = 1, 2$ let $\Gamma_{0,i} \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of nonconstant rectifiable curves $\gamma$ for which $\int_\gamma g_i = \infty$. Then we have via Theorem 3.4 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{0,i}) = 0$ because $g_i \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Thus $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$, where $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma_{0,1} \cup \Gamma_{0,2}$.

For $i = 1, 2$ let $\Gamma_{i,1} \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus \Gamma_0$ for which

$$|u_i(\gamma(0)) - u_i(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g_i$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{1,i}) = 0$ since $g_i$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$, where $\Gamma_1 = \Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2}$.

It is easy to see that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le \max(|u_1(x) - u_1(y)|, |u_2(x) - u_2(y)|). \tag{10}$$

On every curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1)$ we have

$$|u_i(x) - u_i(y)| \le \int_\gamma g_i \le \int_\gamma g.$$

This and (10) show that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \le \int_\gamma g$$

on every curve $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1)$. This finishes the proof.

$\square$

**Lemma 3.16.** *Suppose $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $0 \le u \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Let $\lambda \ge 0$ be fixed. Then $u_\lambda := \min(u, \lambda) \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ and $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u_\lambda$.*

*Proof.* Obviously $0 \le u_\lambda \le u$ on $X$, so it follows via Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition I.1.7] and Kauhanen-Koskela-Malý [20, Proposition 2.1] that $u_\lambda \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ with $||u_\lambda||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \le ||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$. The second claim follows immediately since $|u_\lambda(x) - u_\lambda(y)| \le |u(x) - u(y)|$ for every $x, y \in X$.

$\square$

## 4. NEWTONIAN $L^{p,q}$ SPACES

We denote by $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ the space of all Borel functions $u \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ that have a $p, q$-weak upper gradient $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. We note that $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ is a vector space, since if $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $u_1, u_2 \in \widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ with respective $p, q$-weak upper gradients $g_1, g_2 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$, then $|\alpha| g_1 + |\beta| g_2$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $\alpha u_1 + \beta u_2$.

**Definition 4.1.** If $u$ is a function in $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$, let

$$||u||_{\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}} := \begin{cases} \left(||u||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + \inf_g ||g||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}\right)^{1/q}, & 1 \le q \le p, \\ \left(||u||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + \inf_g ||g||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}\right)^{1/p}, & p < q \le \infty, \end{cases}$$

where the infimum is taken over all $p, q$-integrable $p, q$-weak upper gradients of $u$.

Similarly, let

$$||u||_{\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} := \begin{cases} \left(||u||^q_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + \inf_g ||g||^q_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)}\right)^{1/q}, & 1 \le q \le p, \\ \left(||u||^p_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + \inf_g ||g||^p_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)}\right)^{1/p}, & p < q \le \infty, \end{cases}$$

where the infimum is taken over all $p, q$-integrable $p, q$-weak upper gradients of $u$.

If $u, v$ are functions in $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$, let $u \sim v$ if $||u - v||_{\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}} = 0$. It is easy to see that $\sim$ is an equivalence relation that partitions $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ into equivalence classes. We define the space $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ as the quotient $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)/\sim$ and

$$||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} = ||u||_{\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}} \text{ and } ||u||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} = ||u||_{\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{(p,q)}}}$$

*Remark* 4.2. Via Lemma 3.9 and Corollary 2.8, it is easy to see that the infima in Definition 4.1 could as well be taken over all $p, q$-integrable upper gradients of $u$. We also notice (see the discussion before Definition 2.1) that $||\cdot||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}}$ is a norm whenever $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \le q \le \infty$ , while $||\cdot||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}}$ is a norm when $1 \le q \le p < \infty$. Moreover (see the discussion before Definition 2.1)

$$||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \le ||u||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} \le p'||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}}$$

for every $1 < p < \infty$, $1 \le q \le \infty$ and $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$.

**Definition 4.3.** Let $u : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$ be a given function. We say that

(i) $u$ is absolutely continuous along a rectifiable curve $\gamma$ if $u \circ \gamma$ is absolutely continuous on $[0, \ell(\gamma)]$.

(ii) $u$ is absolutely continuous on $p, q$-almost every curve (has $ACC_{p,q}$ property) if for $p, q$-almost every $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$, $u \circ \gamma$ is absolutely continuous.

**Proposition 4.4.** *If $u$ is a function in $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$, then $u$ is $ACC_{p,q}$.*

*Proof.* We follow Shanmugalingam [27]. By the definition of $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$, $u$ has a $p, q$-weak upper gradient $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Let $\Gamma_0$ be the collection of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ for which

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then by the definition of $p, q$-weak upper gradients, $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$. Let $\Gamma_1$ be the collection of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ that have a subcurve in $\Gamma_0$. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \le \text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$.

Let $\Gamma_2$ be the collection of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that $\int_\gamma g = \infty$. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$ because $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Hence $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2) = 0$. If $\gamma$ is a curve in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$, then $\gamma$ has no subcurves in $\Gamma_0$, and hence

$$|u(\gamma(\beta)) - u(\gamma(\alpha))| \le \int_\alpha^\beta g(\gamma(t))\, dt, \text{ provided } [\alpha, \beta] \subset [0, \ell(\gamma)].$$

This implies the absolute continuity of $u \circ \gamma$ as a consequence of the absolute continuity of the integral. Therefore $u$ is absolutely continuous on every curve $\gamma$ in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2)$. □

**Lemma 4.5.** *Suppose $u$ is a function in $\widetilde{N}^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ such that $||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0$. Then the family*

$$\Gamma = \{\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}} : u(x) \neq 0 \textit{ for some } x \in |\gamma|\}$$

*has zero $p, q$-modulus.*

*Proof.* We follow Shanmugalingam [27]. Since $||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0$, the set $E = \{x \in X : u(x) \neq 0\}$ has measure zero. With the notation introduced earlier, we have

$$\Gamma = \Gamma_E = \Gamma_E^+ \cup (\Gamma_E \setminus \Gamma_E^+).$$

We can disregard the family $\Gamma_E^+$, since

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E^+) \leq ||\infty \cdot \chi_E||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0,$$

where $\chi_E$ is the characteristic function of the set $E$. The curves $\gamma$ in $\Gamma_E \setminus \Gamma_E^+$ intersect $E$ only on a set of linear measure zero, and hence with respect to the linear measure almost everywhere on $\gamma$ the function $u$ is equal to zero. Since $\gamma$ also intersects $E$, it follows that $u$ is *not* absolutely continuous on $\gamma$. By Proposition 4.4, we have $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E \setminus \Gamma_E^+) = 0$, yielding $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma) = 0$. This finishes the proof.

□

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let $F$ be a closed subset of $X$. Suppose that $u : X \to [-\infty, \infty]$ is a Borel $ACC_{p,q}$ function that is constant $\mu$-almost everywhere on $F$. If $g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$, then $g\chi_{X\setminus F}$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$.*

*Proof.* We can assume without loss of generality that $u = 0$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $F$. Let $E = \{x \in F : u(x) \neq 0\}$. Then by assumption $\mu(E) = 0$. Hence $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E^+) = 0$ because $\infty \cdot \chi_E \in F(\Gamma_E^+)$.

Let $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $u$ is not absolutely continuous or on which

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$. Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of curves that have a subcurve in $\Gamma_0$. Then $F(\Gamma_0) \subset F(\Gamma_1)$ and thus $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \leq \mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$.

Let $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $\int_\gamma g = \infty$. Then via Theorem 3.4 we have $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$ because $g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$.

Let $\gamma : [0, \ell(\gamma)] \to X$ be a curve in $\Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_E^+)$ connecting $x$ and $y$. We show that

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq \int_\gamma g\chi_{X\setminus F}$$

for every such curve $\gamma$.

The cases $|\gamma| \subset F \setminus E$ and $|\gamma| \subset (X \setminus F) \cup E$ are trivial. So is the case when both $x$ and $y$ are in $F \setminus E$. Let $K := (u \circ \gamma)^{-1}(\{0\})$. Then $K$ is a compact subset of $[0, \ell(\gamma)]$ because $u \circ \gamma$ is continuous on $[0, \ell(\gamma)]$. Hence $K$ contains its lower bound $c$ and its upper bound $d$. Let $x_1 = \gamma(c)$ and $y_1 = \gamma(d)$.

Suppose that both $x$ and $y$ are in $(X \setminus F) \cup E$. Then we see that $[c, d] \subset (0, \ell(\gamma))$ and $\gamma([0, c) \cup (d, \ell(\gamma)]) \subset (X \setminus F) \cup E$.

Moreover, since $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_1$ and $u(x_1) = u(y_1)$, we have

$$|u(x) - u(y)| \leq |u(x) - u(x_1)| + |u(y_1) - u(y)| \leq \int_{\gamma([0,c])} g + \int_{\gamma([d,\ell(\gamma)])} g \leq \int_\gamma g\chi_{X\setminus F}$$

because the subcurves $\gamma|_{[0,c]}$ and $\gamma|_{[d.\ell(\gamma)]}$ intersect $E$ on a set of Hausdorff 1-measure zero.

Suppose now by symmetry that $x \in (X \setminus F) \cup E$ and $y \in F \setminus E$. This means in terms of our notation that $c > 0$ and $d = \ell(\gamma)$. We notice that $\gamma([0, c)) \subset (X \setminus F) \cup E$ and

$u(x_1) = u(y)$ and thus

$$|u(x) - u(y)| = |u(x) - u(x_1)| \leq \int_{\gamma([0,c])} g \leq \int_\gamma g\chi_{X\setminus F}$$

because the subcurve $\gamma|_{[0,c]}$ intersect $E$ on a set of Hausdorff 1-measure zero.

This finishes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 4.7.** *Assume that $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$, and that $g, h \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ are $p,q$-weak upper gradients of $u$. If $F \subset X$ is a closed set, then*

$$\rho = g\chi_F + h\chi_{X\setminus F}$$

*is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$ as well.*

*Proof.* We follow Hajłasz [13]. Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $\int_\gamma (g + h) = \infty$. Then via Theorem 3.4 it follows that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$ because $g + h \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$.

Let $\Gamma_2 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $u$ is *not* absolutely continuous. Then via Proposition 4.4 we see that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$.

Let $\Gamma_3' \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \min\left(\int_\gamma g, \int_\gamma h\right)$$

is *not* satisfied. Let $\Gamma_3 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves which contain subcurves belonging to $\Gamma_3'$. Since $F(\Gamma_3') \subset F(\Gamma_3)$, we have $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_3) \leq \text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_3') = 0$. Now it remains to show that

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma \rho$$

for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3)$. If $|\gamma| \subset F$ or $|\gamma| \subset X \setminus F$, then the inequality is obvious. Thus we can assume that the image $|\gamma|$ has a nonempty intersection both with $F$ and with $X \setminus F$.

The set $\gamma^{-1}(X \setminus F)$ is open and hence it consists of a countable (or finite) number of open and disjoint intervals. Assume without loss of generality that there are countably many such intervals. Denote these intervals by $((t_i, s_i))_{i=1}^\infty$. Let $\gamma_i = \gamma|_{[t_i,s_i]}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| &\leq |u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(t_1))| + |u(\gamma(t_1)) - u(\gamma(s_1))| \\ &+ |u(\gamma(s_1)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_{\gamma\setminus\gamma_1} g + \int_{\gamma_1} h, \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma \setminus \gamma_1$ denotes the two curves obtained from $\gamma$ by removing the interior part $\gamma_1$, that is the curves $\gamma|_{[0,t_1]}$ and $\gamma|_{[s_1,b]}$. Similarly we can remove a larger number of subcurves of $\gamma$. This yields

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_{\gamma\setminus\cup_{i=1}^n \gamma_i} g + \int_{\cup_{i=1}^n \gamma_i} h$$

for each positive integer $n$. By applying Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem to the curve integral on $\gamma$, we obtain

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g\chi_F + \int_\gamma h\chi_{X\setminus F} = \int_\gamma \rho.$$

□

Next we show that when $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$, every function $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$ has a 'smallest' $p,q$-weak upper gradient. For the case $p = q$ see Kallunki-Shanmugalingam [19] and Shanmugalingam [28].

**Theorem 4.8.** *Suppose that $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$. For every $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$, there exists the least $p,q$-weak upper gradient $g_u \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ of $u$. It is smallest in the sense that if $g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ is another $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$, then $g \geq g_u$ $\mu$-almost everywhere.*

*Proof.* We follow Hajłasz [13]. Let $m = \inf_g ||g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$, where the infimum is taken over the set of all $p,q$-weak upper gradients of $u$. It suffices to show that there exists a $p,q$-weak upper gradient $g_u$ of $u$ such that $||g_u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = m$. Indeed, if we suppose that $g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ is another $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$ such that the set $\{g < g_u\}$ has positive measure, then by the inner regularity of the measure $\mu$ there exists a closed set $F \subset \{g < g_u\}$ such that $\mu(F) > 0$. Via Lemma 4.7 it follows that the function $\rho := g\chi_F + g_u\chi_{X\setminus F}$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient. Via Kauhanen-Koskela-Malý [20, Proposition 2.1] that would give $||\rho||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < ||g_u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = m$, in contradiction with the minimality of $||g_u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$.

Thus it remains to prove the existence of a $p,q$-weak upper gradient $g_u$ such that $||g_u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = m$. Let $(g_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of $p,q$-weak upper gradients of $u$ such that $||g_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < m + 2^{-i}$. We will show that it is possible to modify the sequence $(g_i)$ in such a way that we will obtain a new sequence of $p,q$-weak upper gradients $(\rho_i)$ of $u$ satisfying

$$||\rho_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < m + 2^{1-i}, \quad \rho_1 \geq \rho_2 \geq \rho_3 \geq \dots \ \mu\text{-almost everywhere.}$$

The sequence $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ will be defined by induction. We set $\rho_1 = g_1$. Suppose the $p,q$-weak upper gradients $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_i$ have already been chosen. We will now define $\rho_{i+1}$. Since $\rho_i \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$, the measure $\mu$ is inner regular and the $(p,q)$-norm has the absolute continuity property whenever $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q < \infty$ (see the discussion after Definition 2.1), there exists a closed set $F \subset \{g_{i+1} < \rho_i\}$ such that

$$||\rho_i \chi_{\{g_{i+1}<\rho_i\}\setminus F}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < 2^{-i-1}.$$

Now we set $\rho_{i+1} = g_{i+1}\chi_F + \rho_i\chi_{X\setminus F}$. Then

$$\rho_{i+1} \leq \rho_i \text{ and } \rho_{i+1} \leq g_{i+1}\chi_{F\cup\{g_{i+1}\geq\rho_i\}} + \rho_i\chi_{\{g_{i+1}<\rho_i\}\setminus F}.$$

Suppose first that $1 \leq q \leq p$. Since $||\cdot||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$ is a norm, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} ||\rho_{i+1}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} &\leq ||g_{i+1}\chi_{F\cup\{g_{i+1}\geq\rho_i\}}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||\rho_i\chi_{\{g_{i+1}<\rho_i\}\setminus F}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \\ &< m + 2^{-i-1} + 2^{-i-1} = m + 2^{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that $p < q < \infty$. Then we have via Proposition 2.6

$$\begin{aligned} ||\rho_{i+1}||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} &\leq ||g_{i+1}\chi_{F\cup\{g_{i+1}\geq\rho_i\}}||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||\rho_i\chi_{\{g_{i+1}<\rho_i\}\setminus F}||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \\ &< (m + 2^{-i-1})^p + 2^{-p(i+1)} < (m + 2^{-i})^p. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, no matter what $q \in [1,\infty)$ is, we showed that $m \leq ||\rho_{i+1}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < m + 2^{-i}$. The sequence of $p,q$-weak upper gradients $(\rho_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ converges pointwise to a function $\rho$. The absolute continuity of the $(p,q)$-norm (see Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition I.3.6] and the discussion after Definition 2.1) yields

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} ||\rho_i - \rho||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0.$$

Obviously $||\rho||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = m$. The proof will be finished as soon as we show that $\rho$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $u$.

By taking a subsequence if necessary, we can assume that $||\rho_i - \rho||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \le 2^{-2i}$ for every $i \ge 1$.

Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $\int_\gamma (\rho + \rho_i) = \infty$ for some $i \ge 1$. Then via Theorem 3.4 and the subadditivity of $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\cdot)^{1/p}$ we see that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$ since $\rho + \rho_i \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ for every $i \ge 1$.

For any integer $i \ge 1$ let $\Gamma_{2,i} \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves for which

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma \rho_i$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{2,i}) = 0$ because $\rho_i$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. Let $\Gamma_2 = \cup_{i=1}^{\infty} \Gamma_{2,i}$.

Let $\Gamma_3 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves for which $\limsup_{i\to\infty} \int_\gamma |\rho_i - \rho| > 0$. Then it follows via Theorem 3.6 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_3) = 0$.

Let $\gamma$ be a curve in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_3)$. On any such curve we have (since $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_{2,i}$)

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \int_\gamma \rho_i \text{ for every } i \ge 1.$$

By letting $i \to \infty$, we obtain (since $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3$)

$$|u(\gamma(0)) - u(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \le \lim_{i\to\infty} \int_\gamma \rho_i = \int_\gamma \rho < \infty.$$

This finishes the proof of the theorem.

$\square$

## 5. SOBOLEV $p,q$-CAPACITY

In this section, we establish a general theory of the Sobolev-Lorentz $p,q$-capacity in metric measure spaces. If $(X,d,\mu)$ is a metric measure space, then the Sobolev $p,q$-capacity of a set $E \subset X$ is

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \inf\{||u||^p_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} : u \in \mathcal{A}(E)\},$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}(E) = \{u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu) : u \ge 1 \text{ on E}\}.$$

We call $\mathcal{A}(E)$ the set of *admissible functions* for $E$. If $\mathcal{A}(E) = \emptyset$, then $\text{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \infty$.

*Remark* 5.1. It is easy to see that we can consider only admissible functions $u$ for which $0 \le u \le 1$. Indeed, for $u \in \mathcal{A}(E)$, let $v := \min(u_+, 1)$, where $u_+ = \max(u, 0)$. We notice that $|v(x) - v(y)| \le |u(x) - u(y)|$ for every $x, y$ in $X$, which implies that every $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $u$ is also a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $v$. This implies that $v \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ and $||v||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \le ||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}}$.

### 5.1. Basic properties of the Sobolev $p,q$-capacity.

A capacity is a monotone, subadditive set function. The following theorem expresses, among other things, that this is true for the Sobolev $p,q$-capacity.

**Theorem 5.2.** *Suppose that* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \le q \le \infty$. *Suppose that* $(X,d,\mu)$ *is a complete metric measure space. The set function* $E \mapsto \text{Cap}_{p,q}(E)$, $E \subset X$, *enjoys the following properties:*

(i) *If* $E_1 \subset E_2$, *then* $\text{Cap}_{p,q}(E_1) \le \text{Cap}_{p,q}(E_2)$.

(ii) *Suppose that* $\mu$ *is nonatomic. Suppose that* $1 < q \leq p$. *If* $E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \ldots \subset E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \subset X$, *then*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i).$$

(iii) *Suppose that* $p < q \leq \infty$. *If* $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \subset X$, *then*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i).$$

(iv) *Suppose that* $1 \leq q \leq p$. *If* $E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \subset X$, *then*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)^{q/p} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i)^{q/p}.$$

*Proof.* Property (i) is an immediate consequence of the definition.

(ii) Monotonicity yields

$$L := \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i) \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E).$$

To prove the opposite inequality, we may assume without loss of generality that $L < \infty$. The reflexivity of $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ (guaranteed by the nonatomicity of $\mu$ whenever $1 < q \leq p < \infty$) will be used here in order to prove the opposite inequality.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be fixed. For every $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ we choose $u_i \in \mathcal{A}(E_i)$, $0 \leq u_i \leq 1$ and a corresponding upper gradient $g_i$ such that

$$||u_i||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}}^{q} < \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i)^{q/p} + \varepsilon \leq L^{q/p} + \varepsilon. \tag{11}$$

We notice that $u_i$ is a bounded sequence in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$. Hence there exists a subsequence, which we denote again by $u_i$ and functions $u, g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ such that $u_i \to u$ weakly in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and $g_i \to g$ weakly in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. It is easy to see that

$$u \geq 0 \ \mu\text{-almost everywhere and } g \geq 0 \ \mu\text{-almost everywhere.}$$

Indeed, since $u_i$ converges weakly to $u$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ which is the dual of $L^{p',q'}(X,\mu)$ (see Hunt [18, p. 262]), we have

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \int_X u_i(x)\varphi(x)\, d\mu(x) = \int_X u(x)\varphi(x)\, d\mu(x)$$

for all $\varphi \in L^{p',q'}(X,\mu)$. For nonnegative functions $\varphi \in L^{p',q'}(X,\mu)$ this yields

$$0 \leq \lim_{i\to\infty} \int_X u_i(x)\varphi(x)\, d\mu(x) = \int_X u(x)\varphi(x)\, d\mu(x),$$

which easily implies $u \geq 0$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$. Similarly we have $g \geq 0$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$.

From the weak-$*$ lower semicontinuity of the $p,q$-norm (see Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition II.4.2, Definition IV.4.1 and Theorem IV.4.3] and Hunt [18, p. 262]), it follows that

$$||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \liminf_{i\to\infty} ||u_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \text{ and } ||g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq \liminf_{i\to\infty} ||g_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}. \tag{12}$$

Using Mazur's lemma simultaneously for $u_i$ and $g_i$, we obtain sequences $v_i$ with correspondent upper gradients $\widetilde{g}_i$ such that $v_i \in \mathcal{A}(E_i)$, $v_i \to u$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and $\mu$-almost everywhere and $\widetilde{g}_i \to g$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and $\mu$-almost everywhere. These sequences can be found in the following way. Let $i_0$ be fixed. Since every subsequence of $(u_i, g_i)$ converges to $(u, g)$ weakly in the reflexive space $L^{p,q}(X,\mu) \times L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$, we may use the Mazur lemma (see Yosida [30, p. 120]) for the subsequence $(u_i, g_i)$, $i \geq i_0$.

We obtain finite convex combinations $v_{i_0}$ and $\widetilde{g}_{i_0}$ of the functions $u_i$ and $g_i$, $i \geq i_0$ as close as we want in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ to $u$ and $g$ respectively. For every $i = i_0, i_0+1, \ldots$ we see that $u_i = 1$ in $E_i \supset E_{i_0}$. The intersection of finitely many supersets of $E_{i_0}$ contains $E_{i_0}$. Therefore, $v_{i_0}$ equals 1 on $E_{i_0}$. It is easy to see that $\widetilde{g}_{i_0}$ is an upper gradient for $v_{i_0}$. Passing to subsequences if necessary, we may assume that $v_i$ converges to $u$ pointwise $\mu$-almost everywhere, that $\widetilde{g}_i$ converges to $g$ pointwise $\mu$-almost everywhere and that for every $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ we have

$$||v_{i+1} - v_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||\widetilde{g}_{i+1} - \widetilde{g}_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq 2^{-i}. \tag{13}$$

Since $v_i$ converges to $u$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and pointwise $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$ while $\widetilde{g}_i$ converges to $g$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and pointwise $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$ it follows via Corollary 2.8 that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} ||v_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = ||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \text{ and } \lim_{i\to\infty} ||\widetilde{g}_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = ||g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}. \tag{14}$$

This, (11) and (12) yield

$$||u||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = \lim_{i\to\infty} ||v_i||^q_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \leq L^{q/p} + \varepsilon. \tag{15}$$

For $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ we set

$$w_j = \sup_{i \geq j} v_i \text{ and } \widehat{g}_j = \sup_{i\geq j} \widetilde{g}_i.$$

It is easy to see that $w_j = 1$ on $E$. We claim that $\widehat{g}_j$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $w_j$. Indeed, for every $k > j$, let

$$w_{j,k} = \sup_{k \geq i \geq j} v_i.$$

Via Lemma 3.15 and finite induction, it follows easily that $\widehat{g}_j$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for every $w_{j,k}$ whenever $k > j$. It is easy to see that $w_j = \lim_{k\to\infty} w_{j,k}$ pointwise in $X$. This and Lemma 3.10 imply that $\widehat{g}_j$ is indeed a $p,q$-weak upper gradient for $w_j$.

Moreover,

$$w_j \leq v_j + \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} |v_{i+1} - v_i| \text{ and } \widehat{g}_j \leq \widetilde{g}_j + \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} |\widetilde{g}_{i+1} - \widetilde{g}_i| \tag{16}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} ||w_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} &\leq ||v_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} ||v_{i+1} - v_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||v_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + 2^{-j+1} \text{ and} \\ ||\widehat{g}_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} &\leq ||\widetilde{g}_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} ||\widetilde{g}_{i+1} - \widetilde{g}_i||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||\widetilde{g}_j||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + 2^{-j+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $w_j, \widehat{g}_j \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. Thus $w_j \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ with $p,q$-weak upper gradient $\widehat{g}_j$. We notice that $0 \leq g = \inf_{j\geq 1} \widehat{g}_j$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$ and $0 \leq u = \inf_{j \geq 1} w_j$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X$. Since $w_1$ and $\widehat{g}_1$ are in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$, the absolute continuity of the $p,q$-norm (see Bennett-Sharpley [1, Proposition I.3.6] and the discussion after Definition 2.1) yields

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} ||w_j - u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{j\to\infty} ||\widehat{g}_j - g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0. \tag{17}$$

By using (15), (17), and Corollary 2.8 we see that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)^{q/p} \leq \lim_{j\to\infty} ||w_j||^q_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} = ||u||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq L^{q/p} + \varepsilon.$$

By letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we get the converse inequality so (ii) is proved.

(iii) We can assume without loss of generality that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i)^{q/p} < \infty.$$

For $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ let $u_i \in \mathcal{A}(E_i)$ with upper gradient $g_i$ such that

$$0 \le u_i \le 1 \text{ and } ||u_i||^q_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} < \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i)^{q/p} + \varepsilon 2^{-i}.$$

Let $u := (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} u_i^q)^{1/q}$ and $g := (\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} g_i^q)^{1/q}$. We notice that $u \ge 1$ on $E$. By repeating the argument from the proof of Theorem 3.2 (iii), we see that $u, g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ and

$$||u||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \le \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( ||u_i||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g_i||^q_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \right) \le 2\varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i)^{q/p}.$$

We are done with the case $1 \le q \le p$ as soon as we show that $u \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ and that $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. It follows easily via Corollary 3.14 and finite induction that $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $\widetilde{u}_n := (\sum_{1 \le i \le n} u_i^q)^{1/q}$ for every $n \ge 1$. Since $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \widetilde{u}_i(x) < \infty$ on $X \setminus F$, where $F = \{x \in X : u(x) = \infty\}$ it follows from Lemma 3.10 combined with the fact that $u \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ that $g$ is in fact a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. This finishes the proof for the case $1 \le q \le p$.

(iv) We can assume without loss of generality that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i) < \infty.$$

For $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ let $u_i \in \mathcal{A}(E_i)$ with upper gradients $g_i$ such that

$$0 \le u_i \le 1 \text{ and } ||u_i||^p_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} < \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i) + \varepsilon 2^{-i}.$$

Let $u := \sup_{i\ge1} u_i$ and $g := \sup_{i\ge1} g_i$. We notice that $u = 1$ on $E$. Moreover, via Proposition 2.6 it follows that $u, g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ with

$$||u||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \le \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left( ||u_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||g_i||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \right) \le 2\varepsilon + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E_i).$$

We are done with the case $p < q \le \infty$ as soon as we show that $u \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ and that $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. Via Lemma 3.15 and finite induction, it follows that $g$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $\widetilde{u}_n := \max_{1\le i\le n} u_i$ for every $n \ge 1$. Since $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \widetilde{u}_i(x)$ pointwise on $X$, it follows via Lemma 3.10 that $g$ is in fact a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. This finishes the proof for the case $p < q \le \infty$.

□

*Remark* 5.3. We make a few remarks.

(i) Suppose $\mu$ is nonatomic and $1 < q < \infty$. By mimicking the proof of Theorem 5.2 (ii) and working with the $(p, q)$-norm and the $(p, q)$-capacity, we can also show that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{(p,q)}(E_i) = \mathrm{Cap}_{(p,q)}(E)$$

whenever $E_1 \subset E_2 \subset \ldots \subset E = \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} E_i \subset X$.

(ii) Moreover, if $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}$ is an outer capacity then it follows immediately that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(K_i) = \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(K)$$

whenever $(K_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a decreasing sequence of compact sets whose intersection set is $K$. We say that $\operatorname{Cap}_{p,q}$ is an outer capacity if for every $E \subset X$ we have

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \inf\{\operatorname{Cap}_{p,q}(U) : E \subset U \subset X,\, U \text{ open}\}.$$

(iii) Any outer capacity satisfying properties (i) and (ii) of Theorem 5.2 is called a Choquet capacity. (See Appendix II in Doob [9].)

We recall that if $A \subset X$, then $\Gamma_A$ is the family of curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ that intersect $A$ and $\Gamma_A^+$ is the family of all curves in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that the Hausdorff one-dimensional measure $\mathcal{H}_1(|\gamma| \cap A)$ is positive. The following lemma will be useful later in this paper.

**Lemma 5.4.** *If* $F \subset X$ *is such that* $\operatorname{Cap}_{p,q}(F) = 0$, *then* $\operatorname{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_F) = 0$.

*Proof.* We follow Shanmugalingam [27]. We can assume without loss of generality that $q \neq p$. Since $\operatorname{Cap}_{p,q}(F) = 0$, for each positive integer $i$ there exists a function $v_i \in \mathcal{A}(F)$ such that $0 \leq v_i \leq 1$ and such that $||v_i||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} \leq 2^{-i}$. Let $u_n := \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i$. Then $u_n \in N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}(X,\mu)$ for each $n$, $u_n(x)$ is increasing for each $x \in X$, and for every $m > n$ we have

$$||u_n - u_m||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} \leq \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} ||v_i||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} \leq 2^{-m} \to 0, \text{ as } m \to \infty.$$

Therefore the sequence $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}(X,\mu)$.

Since $\{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ Cauchy in $N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}(X,\mu)$, it follows that it is Cauchy in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. Hence by passing to a subsequence if necessary, there is a function $\widetilde{u}$ in $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ to which the subsequence converges both pointwise $\mu$-almost everywhere and in the $L^{(p,q)}$ norm. By choosing a further subsequence, again denoted by $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ for simplicity, we can assume that

$$||u_i - \widetilde{u}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + ||g_{i,i+1}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \leq 2^{-2i},$$

where $g_{i,j}$ is an upper gradient of $u_i - u_j$ for $i < j$. If $g_1$ is an upper gradient of $u_1$, then $u_2 = u_1 + (u_2 - u_1)$ has an upper gradient $g_2 = g_1 + g_{12}$. In general,

$$u_i = u_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1}(u_{k+1} - u_k)$$

has an upper gradient

$$g_i = g_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} g_{k,k+1}$$

for every $i \geq 2$. For $j < i$ we have

$$||g_i - g_j||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \leq \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} ||g_{k,k+1}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \leq \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} 2^{-2k} \leq 2^{1-2j} \to 0 \text{ as } j \to \infty.$$

Therefore $\{g_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is also a Cauchy sequence in $L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)$, and hence converges in the $L^{(p,q)}$ norm to a nonnegative Borel function $g$. Moreover, we have

$$||g_j - g||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \leq 2^{1-2j}$$

for every $j \geq 1$.

We define $u$ by $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x)$. Since $u_i \to \widetilde{u}$ $\mu$-almost everywhere, it follows that $u = \widetilde{u}$ $\mu$-almost everywhere and thus $u \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$. Let

$$E = \{x \in X : \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x) = \infty\}.$$

The function $u$ is well defined outside of $E$. In order for the function $u$ to be in the space $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$, the function $u$ has to be defined on almost all paths by Proposition 4.4. To this end it is shown that the $p,q$-modulus of the family $\Gamma_E$ is zero. Let $\Gamma_1$ be the collection of all paths from $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that $\int_\gamma g = \infty$. Then we have via Theorem 3.4 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) = 0$ since $g \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$.

Let $\Gamma_2$ be the family of all curves from $\Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ such that $\limsup_{j\to\infty} \int_\gamma |g_j - g| > 0$. Since $||g_j - g||_{L^{p,q}}(X,\mu) \le 2^{1-2j}$ for all $j \ge 1$, it follows via Theorem 3.6 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_2) = 0$.

Since $u \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ and $E = \{x \in X : u(x) = \infty\}$, it follows that $\mu(E) = 0$ and thus $\text{Mod}_{\Gamma_E^+} = 0$. Therefore $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_E^+) = 0$. For any path $\gamma$ in the family $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_E^+)$, by the fact that $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_E^+$, there exists a point in $|\gamma| \setminus E$. For any point $x$ in $\gamma$, since $g_i$ is an upper gradient of $u_i$, it follow that

$$u_i(x) - u_i(y) \le |u_i(x) - u_i(y)| \le \int_\gamma g_i.$$

Therefore

$$u_i(x) \le u_i(y) + \int_\gamma g_i.$$

Taking limits on both sides and using the fact that $\gamma$ is not in $\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$, it follows that

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x) \le \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(y) + \int_\gamma g = u(y) + \int_\gamma g < \infty,$$

and therefore $x$ is not in $E$. Thus $\Gamma_E \subset \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_E^+$ and $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_E) = 0$. Therefore $g$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$, and hence $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$. For each $x$ not in $E$ we can write $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x) < \infty$. If $F \setminus E$ is nonempty, then

$$u|_{F\setminus E} \ge u_n|_{F\setminus E} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i|_{F\setminus E} = n$$

for arbitrarily large $n$, yielding that $u|_{F\setminus E} = \infty$. But this impossible, since $x$ is not in the set $E$. Therefore $F \subset E$, and hence $\Gamma_F \subset \Gamma_E$. This finishes the proof of the lemma. □

Next we prove that $(N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu), ||\cdot||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}})$ is a Banach space.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Suppose* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \le q \le \infty$. *Then* $(N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu), ||\cdot||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}})$ *is a Banach space.*

*Proof.* We follow Shanmugalingam [27]. We can assume without loss of generality that $q \neq p$. Let $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ be a Cauchy sequence in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$. To show that this sequence is convergent in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$, it suffices to show that some subsequence is convergent in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$. Passing to a further subsequence if necessary, it can be assumed that

$$||u_{i+1} - u_i||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + ||g_{i,i+1}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \le 2^{-2i},$$

where $g_{i,j}$ is an upper gradient of $u_i - u_j$ for $i < j$. Let

$$E_j = \{x \in X : |u_{j+1}(x) - u_j(x)| \ge 2^{-j}\}.$$

Then $2^j |u_{j+1} - u_j| \in \mathcal{A}(E_j)$ and hence

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}(E_j)^{1/p} \le 2^j ||u_{j+1} - u_j||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \le 2^{-j}.$$

Let $F_j = \cup_{k=j}^\infty E_k$. Then

$$\text{Cap}_{p,q}(E_j)^{1/p} \le \sum_{k=j}^{\infty} \text{Cap}_{p,q}(E_k)^{1/p} \le 2^{1-j}.$$

Let $F = \cap_{j=1}^{\infty} F_j$. We notice that $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(F) = 0$. If $x$ is a point in $X \setminus F$, there exists $j \geq 1$ such that $x$ is not in $F_j = \cup_{k=j}^{\infty} E_k$. Hence for all $k \geq j$, $x$ is not in $E_k$. Thus $|u_{k+1}(x) - u_k(x)| \leq 2^{-k}$ for all $k \geq j$. Therefore whenever $l \geq k \geq j$ we have that

$$|u_k(x) - u_l(x)| \leq 2^{1-k}.$$

Thus the sequence $\{u_k(x)\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is Cauchy for every $x \in X \setminus F$. For every $x \in X \setminus F$, let $u(x) = \lim_{i\to\infty} u_i(x)$. For $k < m$,

$$u_m = u_k + \sum_{n=k}^{m-1} (u_{n+1} - u_n).$$

Therefore for each $x$ in $X \setminus F$,

$$u(x) = u_k(x) + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (u_{n+1}(x) - u_n(x)). \tag{18}$$

Noting by Lemma 5.4 that $\mathrm{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_F) = 0$ and that for each path $\gamma$ in $\Gamma_{\mathrm{rect}} \setminus \Gamma_F$ equation (18) holds pointwise on $|\gamma|$, we conclude that $\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} g_{n,n+1}$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u - u_k$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
||u - u_k||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} &\leq ||u - u_k||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} ||g_{n,n+1}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \\
&\leq ||u - u_k||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} 2^{-2n} \\
&\leq ||u - u_k||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + 2^{1-2k} \to 0 \text{ as } k \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the subsequence converges in the norm of $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$ to $u$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

□

## 6. DENSITY OF LIPSCHITZ FUNCTIONS IN $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$

### 6.1. Poincaré inequality.

Now we define the weak $(1, L^{p,q})$-*Poincaré inequality*. Podbrdsky in [26] introduced a stronger Poincaré inequality in the case of Banach-valued Newtonian Lorentz spaces.

**Definition 6.1.** The space $(X, d, \mu)$ is said to support a *weak* $(1, L^{p,q})$-*Poincaré inequality* if there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\sigma \geq 1$ such that for all balls $B$ with radius $r$, all $\mu$-measurable functions $u$ on $X$ and all upper gradients $g$ of $u$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |u - u_B| \, d\mu \leq Cr \frac{1}{\mu(\sigma B)^{1/p}} ||g\chi_{\sigma B}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}. \tag{19}$$

Here

$$u_B = \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B u(x) \, d\mu(x)$$

whenever $u$ is a locally $\mu$-integrable function on $X$.

In the above definition we can equivalently assume via Lemma 3.9 and Corollary 2.8 that $g$ is a $p,q$-weak upper gradient of $u$. When $p = q$ we have the weak $(1,p)$-Poincaré inequality. For more about the Poincaré inequality in the case $p = q$ see Hajłasz-Koskela [14] and Heinonen-Koskela [17].

A measure $\mu$ is said to be *doubling* if there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that

$$\mu(2B) \leq C\mu(B)$$

for every ball $B = B(x,r)$ in X. A metric measure space $(X,d,\mu)$ is called *doubling* if the measure $\mu$ is doubling. Under the assumption that the measure $\mu$ is doubling, it is known that $(X,d,\mu)$ is proper (that is, closed bounded subsets of $X$ are compact) if and only if it is complete.

Now we prove that if $1 \leq q \leq p$, the measure $\mu$ is doubling, and the space $(X,d,\mu)$ carries a weak $(1, L^{p,q})$-Poincaré inequality, the Lipschitz functions are dense in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$.

In order to prove this we need a few definitions and lemmas.

**Definition 6.2.** Suppose $(X,d)$ is a metric space that carries a doubling measure $\mu$. For $1 < p < \infty$ and $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ we define the noncentered maximal function operator by

$$M_{p,q}u(x) = \sup_{B \ni x} \frac{||u\chi_B||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}}{\mu(B)^{1/p}},$$

where $u \in L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$.

**Lemma 6.3.** *Suppose $(X,d)$ is a metric space that carries a doubling measure $\mu$. If $1 \leq q \leq p$, then $M_{p,q}$ maps $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ to $L^{p,\infty}(X,\mu)$ boundedly and moreover,*

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} \lambda^p \mu(\{x \in X : M_{p,q}u(x) > \lambda\}) = 0.$$

*Proof.* We can assume without loss of generality that $1 \leq q < p$. For every $R > 0$ let $M_{p,q}^R$ be the restricted maximal function operator defined on $L^{p,q}(X,\mu)$ by

$$M_{p,q}^R u(x) = \sup_{B \ni x,\ \mathrm{diam}(B) \leq R} \frac{||u\chi_B||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}}{\mu(B)^{1/p}}.$$

Denote $G_\lambda = \{x \in X : M_{p,q}u(x) > \lambda\}$ and $G_\lambda^R = \{x \in X : M_{p,q}^R u(x) > \lambda\}$. It is easy to see that $G_\lambda^{R_1} \subset G_\lambda^{R_2}$ if $0 < R_1 < R_2 < \infty$ and $G_\lambda^R \to G_\lambda$ as $R \to \infty$.

Fix $R > 0$. For every $x \in G_\lambda^R$, $\lambda > 0$, there exists a ball $B(y_x, r_x)$ with diameter at most $R$ such that $x \in B(y_x, r_x)$ and such that

$$||u\chi_{B(y_x,r_x)}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}^p > \lambda^p \mu(B(y_x,r_x)).$$

We notice that $B(y_x,r_x) \subset G_\lambda^R$. The set $G_\lambda^R$ is covered by such balls and by Theorem 1.2 in Heinonen [15] it follows that there exists a countable disjoint subcollection $\{B(x_i,r_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ such that the collection $\{B(x_i,5r_i)\}_{i=1}^\infty$ covers $G_\lambda^R$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(G_\lambda^R) &\leq \sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(B(x_i,5r_i)) \leq C\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty \mu(B(x_i,r_i))\right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p}\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty ||u\chi_{B(x_i,r_i)}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}^p\right) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p}||u\chi_{G_\lambda^R}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}^p. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality in the sequence was obtained by applying Proposition 2.4. (See also Chung-Hunt-Kurtz [5, Lemma 2.5].)

Thus

$$\mu(G_\lambda^R) \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p}||u\chi_{G_\lambda^R}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}^p \leq \frac{C}{\lambda^p}||u\chi_{G_\lambda}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}^p$$

for every $R > 0$. Since $G_\lambda = \bigcup_{R>0} G_\lambda^R$, we obtain (by taking the limit as $R \to \infty$)

$$\mu(G_\lambda) \le \frac{C}{\lambda^p} ||u\chi_{G_\lambda}||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}.$$

The absolute continuity of the $p, q$-norm (see the discussion after Definition 2.1), the $p, q$-integrability of $u$ and the fact that $G_\lambda \to \emptyset$ $\mu$-almost everywhere as $\lambda \to \infty$ yield the desired conclusion.

□

**Question 6.4.** Is Lemma 6.3 true when $p < q < \infty$ ?

The following proposition is necessary in the sequel.

**Proposition 6.5.** *Suppose* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \le q < \infty$. *If* $u$ *is a nonnegative function in* $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$, *then the sequence of functions* $u_k = \min(u, k)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$, *converges in the norm of* $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ *to* $u$ *as* $k \to \infty$.

*Proof.* We notice (see Lemma 3.16) that $u_k \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. That lemma also yields easily $u_k \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ and moreover $||u_k||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \le ||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}}$ for all $k \ge 1$.

Let $E_k = \{x \in X : u(x) > k\}$. Since $\mu$ is a Borel regular measure, there exists an open set $O_k$ such that $E_k \subset O_k$ and $\mu(O_k) \le \mu(E_k) + 2^{-k}$. In fact the sequence $(O_k)_{k=1}^\infty$ can be chosen such that $O_{k+1} \subset O_k$ for all $k \ge 1$. Since $\mu(E_k) \le \frac{C(p,q)}{k^p} ||u||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}$, it follows that

$$\mu(O_k) \le \mu(E_k) + 2^{-k} \le \frac{C(p, q)}{k^p} ||u||^p_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + 2^{-k}.$$

Thus $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mu(O_k) = 0$. We notice that $u = u_k$ on $X \setminus O_k$. Thus $2g\chi_{O_k}$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $u - u_k$ whenever $g$ is an upper gradient for $u$ and $u_k$. See Lemma 4.6. The fact that $O_k \to \emptyset$ $\mu$-almost everywhere and the absolute continuity of the $(p, q)$-norm yield

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} ||u - u_k||_{N^{1,L^{(p,q)}}} \le 2 \limsup_{k\to\infty} \left( ||u\chi_{O_k}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} + ||g\chi_{O_k}||_{L^{(p,q)}(X,\mu)} \right) = 0.$$

□

**Counterexample 6.6.** For $q = \infty$ Proposition 6.5 is not true. Indeed, let $n \ge 2$ be an integer and let $1 < p \le n$ be fixed. Let $X = B(0, 1) \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, endowed with the Euclidean metric and the Lebesgue measure.

Suppose first that $1 < p < n$. Let $u_p$ and $g_p$ be defined on $X$ by

$$u_p(x) = |x|^{1-\frac{n}{p}} - 1 \text{ and } g_p(x) = \left(\frac{n}{p} - 1\right) |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}}.$$

It is easy to see that $u_p, g_p \in L^{p,\infty}(X, m_n)$. Moreover, (see for instance Hajłasz [13, Proposition 6.4]) $g_p$ is the minimal upper gradient for $u_p$. Thus $u_p \in N^{1,L^{p,\infty}}(X, m_n)$. For every integer $k \ge 1$ we define $u_{p,k}$ and $g_{p,k}$ on $X$ by

$$u_{p,k}(x) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } 0 < |x| \le (k + 1)^{\frac{p}{p-n}}, \\ |x|^{1-\frac{n}{p}} - 1 & \text{if } (k + 1)^{\frac{p}{p-n}} < |x| < 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$g_{p,k}(x) = \begin{cases} \left(\frac{n}{p} - 1\right) |x|^{-\frac{n}{p}} & \text{if } 0 < |x| < (k + 1)^{\frac{p}{p-n}} \\ 0 & \text{if } (k + 1)^{\frac{p}{p-n}} \le |x| < 1. \end{cases}$$

We notice that $u_{p,k} \in N^{1,L^{p,\infty}}(X, m_n)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Moreover, via [13, Proposition 6.4] and Lemma 4.6 we see that $g_{p,k}$ is the minimal upper gradient for $u_p - u_{p,k}$ for every $k \geq 1$. Since $g_{p,k} \searrow 0$ on $X$ as $k \to \infty$ and $||g_{p,k}||_{L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)} = ||g_p||_{L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)} = C(n,p) > 0$ for all $k \geq 1$, it follows that $u_{p,k}$ does *not* converge to $u_p$ in $N^{1,L^{p,\infty}}(X, m_n)$ as $k \to \infty$.

Suppose now that $p = n$. Let $u_n$ and $g_n$ be defined on $X$ by

$$u_n(x) = \ln \frac{1}{|x|} \text{ and } g_n(x) = \frac{1}{|x|}.$$

It is easy to see that $u_n, g_n \in L^{p,\infty}(X, m_n)$. Moreover, (see for instance Hajłasz [13, Proposition 6.4]) $g_n$ is the minimal upper gradient for $u_n$. Thus $u_n \in N^{1,L^{n,\infty}}(X, m_n)$. For every integer $k \geq 1$ we define $u_{n,k}$ and $g_{n,k}$ on $X$ by

$$u_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } 0 < |x| \leq e^{-k}, \\ \ln \frac{1}{|x|} & \text{if } e^{-k} < |x| < 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$g_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{|x|} & \text{if } 0 < |x| < e^{-k} \\ 0 & \text{if } e^{-k} \leq |x| < 1. \end{cases}$$

We notice that $u_{n,k} \in N^{1,L^{n,\infty}}(X, m_n)$ for all $k \geq 1$. Moreover, via [13, Proposition 6.4] and Lemma 4.6 we see that $g_{n,k}$ is the minimal upper gradient for $u_n - u_{n,k}$ for every $k \geq 1$. Since $g_{n,k} \searrow 0$ on $X$ as $k \to \infty$ and $||g_{n,k}||_{L^{p,\infty}(X,m_n)} = ||g_n||_{L^{n,\infty}(X,m_n)} = C(n) > 0$ for all $k \geq 1$, it follows that $u_{n,k}$ does *not* converge to $u_n$ in $N^{1,L^{n,\infty}}(X, m_n)$ as $k \to \infty$.

The following lemma will be used in the paper.

**Lemma 6.7.** *Let $f_1 \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ be a bounded Borel function with $p, q$-weak upper gradient $g_1 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ and let $f_2$ be a bounded Borel function with $p, q$-weak upper gradient $g_2 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Then $f_3 := f_1 f_2 \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ and $g_3 := |f_1| g_2 + |f_2| g_1$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient of $f_3$.*

*Proof.* It is easy to see that $f_3$ and $g_3$ are in $L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$. Let $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves on which $\int_\gamma (g_1 + g_2) = \infty$. Then it follows via Theorem 3.4 that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0) = 0$ because $g_1 + g_2 \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$.

Let $\Gamma_{1,i} \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}, i = 1, 2$ be the family of curves for which

$$|f_i(\gamma(0)) - f_i(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_\gamma g_i$$

is *not* satisfied. Then $\text{Mod}_{\Gamma_{1,i}} = 0, i = 1, 2$. Let $\Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_{\text{rect}}$ be the family of curves that have a subcurve in $\Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2}$. Then $F(\Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2}) \subset F(\Gamma_1)$ and thus $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_1) \leq \text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_{1,1} \cup \Gamma_{1,2}) = 0$. We notice immediately that $\text{Mod}_{p,q}(\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1) = 0$.

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. By using the argument from Lemma 1.7 in Cheeger [4], we see that

$$|f_3(\gamma(0)) - f_3(\gamma(\ell(\gamma)))| \leq \int_0^{\ell(\gamma)} (|f_1(\gamma(s))| + \varepsilon) g_2(\gamma(s)) + (|f_2(\gamma(s))| + \varepsilon) g_1(\gamma(s))\, ds$$

for every curve $\gamma$ in $\Gamma_{\text{rect}} \setminus (\Gamma_0 \cup \Gamma_1)$. Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ we obtain the desired claim.

□

Fix $x_0 \in X$. For each integer $j > 1$ we consider the function

$$\eta_j(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d(x_0, x) \le j-1, \\ j - d(x_0, x) & \text{if } j-1 < d(x_0, x) \le j, \\ 0 & \text{if } d(x_0, x) > j. \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 6.8.** *Suppose $1 \le q < \infty$. Let $u$ be a bounded function in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$. Then the function $v_j = u\eta_j$ is also in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$. Furthermore, the sequence $v_j$ converges to $u$ in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$.*

*Proof.* We can assume without loss of generality that $u \ge 0$. Let $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ be an upper gradient for $u$. It is easy to see by invoking Lemma 4.6 that $h_j := \chi_{B(x_0,j)\setminus \overline{B}(x_0,j-1)}$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $\eta_j$ and for $1 - \eta_j$. By using Lemma 6.7, we see that $v_j \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ and that $g_j := uh_j + g\eta_j$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $v_j$. By using Lemma 6.7 we notice that $\widetilde{h}_j := uh_j + g(1 - \eta_j)$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u - v_j$. We have in fact

$$0 \le u - v_j \le u\chi_{X\setminus B(x_0,j-1)} \text{ and } \widetilde{h}_j \le (u + g)\chi_{X\setminus B(x_0,j-1)}. \tag{20}$$

for every $j > 1$. The absolute continuity of the $(p, q)$-norm when $1 \le q < \infty$ (see the discussion after Definition 2.1) together with the $p, q$-integrability of $u, g$ and (20) yield the desired claim.

□

Now we prove the density of the Lipschitz functions in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ when $1 \le q < p$. The case $q = p$ was proved by Shanmugalingam. (See [27] and [28].)

**Theorem 6.9.** *Let $1 \le q \le p < \infty$. Suppose that $(X, d, \mu)$ is a doubling metric measure space that carries a weak $(1, L^{p,q})$-Poincaré inequality. Then the Lipschitz functions are dense in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$.*

*Proof.* We can consider only the case $1 \le q < p$ because the case $q = p$ was proved by Shanmugalingam in [27] and [28]. We can assume without loss of generality that $u$ is nonnegative. Moreover, via Lemmas 6.5 and 6.7 we can assume without loss of generality that $u$ is bounded and has compact support in $X$. Choose $M > 0$ such that $0 \le u \le M$ on $X$. Let $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ be a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u$. Let $\sigma \ge 1$ be the constant from the weak $(1, L^{p,q})$-Poincaré inequality.

Let $G_\lambda := \{x \in X : M_{p,q}g(x) > \lambda\}$. If $x$ is a point in the closed set $X \setminus G_\lambda$, then for all $r > 0$ one has that

$$\frac{1}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} |u - u_{B(x,r)}|\, d\mu \le Cr \frac{||g\chi_{B(x,\sigma r)}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}}{\mu(B(x, \sigma r))^{1/p}} \le CrM_{p,q}g(x) \le C\lambda r.$$

Hence for $s \in [r/2, r]$ one has that

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{B(x,s)} - u_{B(x,r)}| &\le \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,s))} \int_{B(x,s)} |u - u_{B(x,r)}|\, d\mu \\ &\le \frac{\mu(B(x,r))}{\mu(B(x,s))} \cdot \frac{1}{\mu(B(x,r))} \int_{B(x,r)} |u - u_{B(x,r)}|\, d\mu \le C\lambda r \end{aligned}$$

whenever $x$ is in $X \setminus G_\lambda$. For a fixed $s \in (0, r/2)$ there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that $2^{-k}r \leq 2s < 2^{-k+1}r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{B(x,s)} - u_{B(x,r)}| &\leq |u_{B(x,s)} - u_{B(x,2^{-k}r)}| + \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} |u_{B(x,2^{-i-1}r)} - u_{B(x,2^{-i}r)}| \leq C\lambda \left( \sum_{i=0}^{k} 2^{-i} r \right) \leq C\lambda r. \end{aligned}$$

For any sequence $r_i \searrow 0$ we notice that $(u_{B(x,r_i)})_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence for every point $x$ in $X \setminus G_\lambda$. Thus on $X \setminus G_\lambda$ we can define the function

$$u_\lambda(x) := \lim_{r \to 0} u_{B(x,r)}.$$

We notice that $u_\lambda(x) = u(x)$ for every Lebesgue point $x$ in $X \setminus G_\lambda$.

For every $x, y$ in $X \setminus G_\lambda$ we consider the chain of balls $\{B_i\}_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$, where

$$B_i = B(x, 2^{1+i} d(x,y)), i \leq 0 \text{ and } B_i = B(y, 2^{1-i} d(x,y)), i > 0.$$

For every two such points $x$ and $y$ we have that they are Lebesgue points for $u_\lambda$ by construction and hence

$$|u_\lambda(x) - u_\lambda(y)| \leq \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} |u_{B_i} - u_{B_{i+1}}| \leq C\lambda d(x,y),$$

where $C$ depends only on the data on $X$. Thus $u_\lambda$ is $C\lambda$-Lipschitz on $X \setminus G_\lambda$. By construction it follows that $0 \leq u_\lambda \leq M$ on $X \setminus G_\lambda$. Extend $u_\lambda$ as a $C\lambda$-Lipschitz function on $X$ (see McShane [25]) and denote the extension by $v_\lambda$. Then $v_\lambda \geq 0$ on $X$ since $u_\lambda \geq 0$ on $X \setminus G_\lambda$. Let $w_\lambda := \min(v_\lambda, M)$. We notice that $w_\lambda$ is a nonnegative $C\lambda$-Lipschitz function on $X$ since $v_\lambda$ is. Moreover, $w_\lambda = v_\lambda = u_\lambda$ on $X \setminus G_\lambda$ whenever $\lambda > M$.

Since $u = w_\lambda$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on $X \setminus G_\lambda$ whenever $\lambda > M$ we have

$$||u - w_\lambda||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = ||(u - w_\lambda)\chi_{G_\lambda}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} \leq ||u\chi_{G_\lambda}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + C(p,q)\lambda\mu(G_\lambda)^{1/p}$$

whenever $\lambda > M$. The absolute continuity of the $p, q$-norm when $1 \leq q \leq p$ together with Lemma 6.3 imply that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} ||u - w_\lambda||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0.$$

Since $u - w_\lambda = 0$ $\mu$-almost everywhere on the closed set $G_\lambda$, it follows via Lemma 4.6 that $(C\lambda + g)\chi_{G_\lambda}$ is a $p, q$-weak upper gradient for $u - w_\lambda$. By using the absolute continuity of the $p, q$-norm when $1 \leq q \leq p$ together with Lemma 6.3, we see that

$$\lim_{\lambda \to \infty} ||(C\lambda + g)\chi_{G_\lambda}||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} = 0.$$

This finishes the proof of the theorem.

□

Theorem 6.9 yields the following result.

**Proposition 6.10.** *Let $1 \leq q \leq p < \infty$. Suppose that $(X, d, \mu)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 6.9. Then* $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}$ *is an outer capacity.*

In order to prove Proposition 6.10 we need to state and prove the following proposition, thus generalizing Proposition 1.4 from Björn-Björn-Shanmugalingam [3].

**Proposition 6.11.** *(See* [3, Proposition 1.4]*) Let* $1 < p < \infty$ *and* $1 \leq q < \infty$. *Suppose that* $(X, d, \mu)$ *is a proper metric measure space. Let* $E \subset X$ *be such that* $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = 0$. *Then for every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *there exists an open set* $U \supset E$ *with* $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(U) < \varepsilon$.

*Proof.* We adjust the proof of Proposition 1.4 in Björn-Björn-Shanmugalingam [3] to the Lorentz setting with some modifications. It is enough to consider the case when $q \neq p$. Due to the countable subadditivity of $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(\cdot)^{1/p}$ we can assume without loss of generality that $E$ is bounded. Moreover, we can also assume that $E$ is Borel. Since $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = 0$, we have $\chi_E \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ and $||\chi_E||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} = 0$. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be arbitrary. Via Lemma 3.9 and Corollary 2.8, there exists $g \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ such that $g$ is an upper gradient for $\chi_E$ and $||g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \varepsilon$. By adapting the proof of the Vitali-Carathéodory theorem to the Lorentz setting (see Folland [10, Proposition 7.14]) we can find a lower semicontinuous function $\rho \in L^{p,q}(X, \mu)$ such that $\rho \geq g$ and $||\rho - g||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \varepsilon$. Since $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = 0$, it follows immediately that $\mu(E) = 0$. By using the outer regularity of the measure $\mu$ and the absolute continuity of the $(p, q)$-norm, there exists a bounded open set $V \supset E$ such that

$$||\chi_V||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||(\rho + 1)\chi_V||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Let

$$u(x) = \min\left\{1, \inf_{\gamma} \int_{\gamma} (\rho + 1)\right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all the rectifiable (including constant) curves connecting $x$ to the closed set $X \setminus V$. We notice immediately that $0 \leq u \leq 1$ on $X$ and $u = 0$ on $X \setminus V$. By Björn-Björn-Shanmugalingam [3, Lemma 3.3] it follows that $u$ is lower semicontinuous on $X$ and thus the set $U = \{x \in X : u(x) > \frac{1}{2}\}$ is open. We notice that for $x \in E$ and every curve connecting $x$ to some $y \in X \setminus V$, we have

$$\int_{\gamma} (\rho + 1) \geq \int_{\gamma} \rho \geq \chi_E(x) - \chi_E(y) = 1.$$

Thus $u = 1$ on $E$ and $E \subset U \subset V$. From [3, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2] it follows that $(\rho + 1)\chi_V$ is an upper gradient of $u$. Since $0 \leq u \leq \chi_V$ and $u$ is lower semicontinuous, it follows that $u \in N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$. Moreover, $2u \in \mathcal{A}(U)$ and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(U)^{1/p} &\leq 2||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} \leq 2(||u||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||(\rho + 1)\chi_V||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}) \\ &\leq 2(||\chi_V||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)} + ||(\rho + 1)\chi_V||_{L^{p,q}(X,\mu)}) < \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

This finishes the proof of Proposition 6.11.

□

Now we prove Proposition 6.10.

*Proof.* We start the proof of Proposition 6.10 by showing that every function $u$ in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$ is continuous outside open sets of arbitrarily small $p, q$-capacity. (Such a function is called $p, q$-quasicontinuous.) Indeed, let $u$ be a function in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X, \mu)$. From Theorem 6.9 there exists a sequence $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ of Lipschitz functions on $X$ such that

$$||u_j - u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} < 2^{-2j} \text{ for every integer } j \geq 1.$$

For every integer $j \geq 1$ let

$$E_j = \{x \in X : |u_{j+1}(x) - u_j(x)| > 2^{-j}\}.$$

Then all the sets $E_j$ are open because the all functions $u_j$ are Lipschitz. By letting $F = \cap_{j=1}^{\infty} \cup_{k=j}^{\infty} E_k$ and applying the argument from Theorem 5.5 to the sequence $\{u_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ which is Cauchy in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$, we see that $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(F) = 0$ and the sequence $\{u_k\}$ converges in $N^{1,L^{p,q}}(X,\mu)$ to a function $\widetilde{u}$ whose restriction on $X \setminus F$ is continuous. Thus $||u - \widetilde{u}||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} = 0$ and hence if we let $E = \{x \in X : u(x) \neq \widetilde{u}(x)\}$, we have $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = 0$. Therefore $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E \cup F) = 0$ and hence, via Proposition 6.11 we have that $u = \widetilde{u}$ outside open supersets of $E \cup F$ of arbitrarily small $p,q$-capacity. This shows that $u$ is quasicontinuous.

Now we fix $E \subset X$ and we show that

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \inf\{\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(U), E \subset U \subset X,\, U \text{ open}\}.$$

For a fixed $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ we choose $u \in \mathcal{A}(E)$ such that $0 \leq u \leq 1$ on $X$ and such that

$$||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} < \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)^{1/p} + \varepsilon.$$

We have that $u$ is $p,q$-quasicontinuous and hence there is an open set $V$ such that $\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(V)^{1/p} < \varepsilon$ and such that $u|_{X\setminus V}$ is continuous. Thus there exists an open set $U$ such that $U \setminus V = \{x \in X : u(x) > 1-\varepsilon\} \setminus V \supset E \setminus V$. We see that $U \cup V = (U \setminus V) \cup V$ is an open set containing $E \cup V = (E \setminus V) \cup V$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)^{1/p} &\leq \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(U \cup V)^{1/p} \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(U \setminus V)^{1/p} + \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(V)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}||u||_{N^{1,L^{p,q}}} + \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(V)^{1/p} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}(\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)^{1/p} + \varepsilon) + \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$ finishes the proof of Proposition 6.10.

□

Theorems 5.2 and 6.9 together with Proposition 6.10 and Remark 5.3 yield immediately the following capacitability result. (See also Appendix II in Doob [9].)

**Theorem 6.12.** *Let $1 < q \leq p < \infty$. Suppose that $(X, d, \mu)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Theorem 6.9. The set function $E \mapsto \mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E)$ is a Choquet capacity. In particular, all Borel subsets (in fact, all analytic subsets) $E$ of $X$ are capacitable, that is*

$$\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(E) = \sup\{\mathrm{Cap}_{p,q}(K) : K \subset E,\, K \text{ compact}\}$$

*whenever $E \subset X$ is Borel (or analytic).*

*Remark* 6.13. Counterexample 6.6 gives also a counterexample to the density result for $N^{1,L^{p,\infty}}$ in the Euclidean setting for $1 < p \leq n$ and $q = \infty$.

## REFERENCES

[1] C. Bennett and R. Sharpley. *Interpolation of Operators.* Academic Press, 1988.

[2] J. Björn. Boundary continuity for quasiminimizers on metric spaces. *Illinois J. Math.*, **46** (2002), no. 2, 383–403.

[3] A. Björn, J. Björn and N. Shanmugalingam. Quasicontinuity of Newton-Sobolev functions and density of Lipschitz functions in metric measure spaces. *Houston J. Math.*, **34** (2008), no. 4, 1197–1211.

[4] J. Cheeger. Differentiability of Lipschitz functions on metric spaces. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, **9** (1999), 428–517.

[5] H.M. Chung, R.A. Hunt, D.S. Kurtz. The Hardy-Littlewood maximal function on $L(p,q)$ spaces with weights. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **31** (1982), no. 1, 109–120.

[6] Ş. Costea. Scaling invariant Sobolev-Lorentz capacity on $\mathbb{R}^n$. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **56** (2007), no. 6, 2641–2669.

[7] Ş. Costea. Sobolev capacity and Hausdorff measures in metric measure spaces, *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math*, **34** (2009), no. 1, 179-194.

[8] Ş. Costea and V. Maz'ya. Conductor inequalities and criteria for Sobolev-Lorentz two-weight inequalities, *Sobolev Spaces in Mathematics II. Applications in Analysis and Partial Differential Equations*, p. 103-121, Springer, (2009).

[9] J.L. Doob. *Classical Potential Theory and its Probabilistic Counterpart.* Springer-Verlag, 1984.

[10] G.B. Folland. *Real Analysis.* 2nd edition. John Wiley and Sons, 1999.

[11] B. Franchi, P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela. Definitions of Sobolev classes on metric spaces. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, **49** (1999), 1903–1924.

[12] P. Hajłasz. Sobolev spaces on an arbitrary metric space. *Potential Anal.*, **5** (1996), 403–415.

[13] P. Hajłasz. Sobolev spaces on metric-measure spaces. (Heat kernels and analysis on manifolds, graphs, and metric spaces (Paris, 2002)) *Contemp. Math.*, **338** (2003) Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 173–218.

[14] P. Hajłasz and P. Koskela. *Sobolev met Poincaré.* Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 2000.

[15] J. Heinonen. *Lectures on Analysis on Metric Spaces.* Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[16] J. Heinonen, T. Kilpeläinen and O. Martio. *Nonlinear Potential Theory of Degenerate Elliptic Equations.* Oxford University Press, 1993.

[17] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela. Quasiconformal maps in metric spaces with controlled geometry. *Acta Math.*, **181** (1998), 1–61.

[18] R. Hunt. On $L(p,q)$ measure spaces. *Enseignement Math.*, **12** (1966), no. 2, 249–276

[19] S. Kallunki and N. Shanmugalingam. Modulus and continuous capacity. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math*, **26** (2001), no. 2, 455–464.

[20] J. Kauhanen, P. Koskela and J. Malý. On functions with derivatives in a Lorentz space. *Manuscripta Math.*, **100** (1999), no. 1, 87–101.

[21] J. Kinnunen and O. Martio. The Sobolev capacity on metric spaces. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math*, **21** (1996), no. 2, 367–382.

[22] J. Kinnunen and O. Martio. Choquet property for the Sobolev capacity in metric spaces. In *Proceedings of the conference on Analysis and Geometry held in Novosibirsk*, pages 285–290, 2000.

[23] P. Koskela and P. MacManus. Quasiconformal mappings and Sobolev spaces. *Studia Math.*, **131** (1998), 1–17.

[24] V. Maz'ya. *Sobolev Spaces.* Springer-Verlag, 1985.

[25] E.J. McShane. Extension of range of functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **40** (1934), no. 12, 837–842.

[26] P. Podbrdsky. *Fine properties of Sobolev functions* (in Czech). Preprint, 2004.

[27] N. Shanmugalingam. Newtonian spaces: An extension of Sobolev spaces to metric measure spaces. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, **16** (2000), no. 2, 243–279.

[28] N. Shanmugalingam. Harmonic functions on metric spaces. *Illinois J. Math.*, **45** (2001), no. 3, 1021–1050.

[29] E. Stein, G. Weiss. *Introduction to Fourier Analysis on Euclidean Spaces.* Princeton University Press, 1975.

[30] K. Yosida. *Functional Analysis.* Springer-Verlag, 1980.

Ş. COSTEA, EPFL SB MATHGEOM, SECTION DE MATHÉMATIQUES, STATION 8, CH-1015 LAUSANNE, SWITZERLAND
*E-mail address*: `serban.costea@epfl.ch`

M. MIRANDA JR., DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF FERRARA, VIA MACHIAVELLI 35, I-44121 FERRARA, ITALY
*E-mail address*: `michele.miranda@unife.it`